

percent drop in the cancer death rate since 1991.

Thirty years ago, HIV was a death sentence, but because of NIH research, that is no longer the case.

And because of NIH funding, we are also on the verge of curing—yes, curing—sickle cell anemia, an inherited blood disorder that primarily affects African Americans.

Consider this: NIH funding contributed to research associated with every new drug approved by the Food and Drug Administration from 2010 to 2019.

Let me repeat that for emphasis. There are only two countries in the world that allow general advertising of prescription drugs—the United States and New Zealand. You can't turn on the television without hearing the story of a new drug. Every single drug approved by the Food and Drug Administration from 2010 to 2019 started off with government-funded, taxpayer-funded research at the National Institutes of Health.

So when you see these wonderful drugs, understand we, as Americans, put down the initial investment that made these drugs all possible.

However, there is a real threat to our Nation's investment in medical research. The new House Republican majority, after more than a dozen—in fact, 15—painful and embarrassing failed votes to secure the Speaker, announced that Speaker McCarthy had finally won the day, he made some deals, agreements with MAGA Republicans for that to happen.

One of those agreements would literally devastate funding for medical research in the future. What a price to pay.

He reportedly agreed to hamstringing government funding for 2024 at 2022 levels—a senseless move—senseless move—that would cut funding for scientific breakthroughs by roughly 7 percent and delay the delivery of new cures and treatments for those most in need.

So I would like to know, for the record, which diseases and conditions would Speaker McCarthy and the House Republicans like us to slash funding for? Cancer? Alzheimer's? Parkinson's? Diabetes? ALS? Heart disease? Which one?

Speak up, Mr. Speaker. This is supposed to be a new transparent House of Representatives. If you are going to cut funding in medical research, what can we put on the back of the burner, and how can we explain that to the families across America?

Now is not the time for political horse-trading that puts one person in power at the expense of everyone waiting for a cure.

We need to build on the bipartisan success which we have had to date and we have achieved over the past decade and continue to prioritize medical research funding that creates jobs but, most importantly, saves lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

SOUTHERN BORDER

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about the border one more time, but I was intrigued by the rhetorical questions my friend from Illinois has asked the Speaker.

I have got a question for President Biden: When you say that you are not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling, does that mean that the Federal Government is going to continue to rack up more and more debt on top of the \$30 trillion that we already owe, particularly during inflationary times when interest rates on that debt basically are eating up more and more of our discretionary budget?

To me, if the answer is yes, I am going to refuse to negotiate as we continue to rack up more and more debt, about two-thirds of which is on autopilot, as the Presiding Officer knows—it is mandatory spending. That is a supremely irresponsible position to take.

President Biden, when he was in the Senate, was known as a dealmaker, and as I said yesterday, during 2011, he negotiated with Senator McConnell the Budget Control Act, which was probably the most recent response, sort of a mixed bag as it was, to try to control Federal spending. It was a noble effort, although it did not succeed.

So I know our friends on the Democratic side would like to sort of add to Mr. McCarthy's challenges. We have got 6 months, perhaps, between now and the time the extraordinary measures the Treasury Department is going to be using to make sure we don't actually breach that debt limit, but I would suggest that the time would be better used, rather than sort of to add gasoline to the fire, to actually try to solve the problem. And the problem—the debt limit—is real. It needs to be addressed by two people: Speaker McCarthy and the President of the United States. Because anything the Senate were to pass with 60 votes, which would be required, would certainly be dead on arrival in the House of Representatives.

And so as a practical matter, while we are going to be very interested and engaged in the debate and discussion, that is where the decision is going to have to be made sometime between now and the time extraordinary measures are exhausted, perhaps as early as June.

But in the meantime, for the President of the United States, who represents not just Democrats, who represents all Americans—all 330 million-plus of us—to say: I am not negotiating, even though he has got a track record as a Senator and as a Vice President of negotiating hard things like this, to me, is an irresponsible answer, and I hope he will reconsider.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Now, Mr. President, to talk about what I came here to talk about—talk about the border.

I live in a border State. We have 1,200 miles of border with Mexico. We have, as a country, 2,000 miles of border with Mexico. And we are seeing numbers of people showing up at the border that we have never seen before—millions of people since President Biden was sworn in as President on January 20, 2021, millions of people showing up, many of whom are claiming asylum and seeking to immigrate permanently into the United States under the asylum laws. Because the administration has a policy of releasing those individuals into the interior of the United States to await a future immigration court hearing, which may be years in the future because of backlog, many of those individuals do not show up at their immigration court hearing but simply are willing to play the odds that they can just melt into the Great American heartland and not be returned or repatriated to their country of origin or actually have to appear at an asylum hearing.

We know that, statistically, the number of people who actually do show up for an asylum hearing in front of an immigration judge, only roughly 90 percent of them fail to meet the very stringent requirement for asylum, which is basically a credible fear of persecution based on some classification: race, sex, ethnic origin, or the like. That is a very narrow test, and it certainly does not include fear of poverty or even violence in your home country. Yet the policy of the Biden administration to basically create open borders and place individuals who show up and claim asylum—these are not people trying to run away from the Border Patrol, by the way. These are people who are turning themselves in because they know they can play the system, and they will be able to make their way into the United States without any consequences—certainly, no legal consequences.

I am sure those of my colleagues who have visited the border—and we had a bipartisan group just a couple weeks ago who did visit again both Yuma, AZ, and El Paso. But as my colleagues can attest, there is no data, there is no image there, frankly, or no words to adequately convey the complexity of what is happening at the border today. To understand, you have to see and hear for yourself.

Several years ago, I traveled to Brooks County, which is a little county in South Texas, where I visited a ranch that the Border Patrol had a rescue beacon in the middle of.

And just to explain, the Border Patrol does a lot of humanitarian rescues because, as you can imagine, people coming from Central America, up across the land bridge into Mexico, up to the United States, many of them show up dehydrated, suffering from exposure, and some of them, frankly, die on the trip. But the Border Patrol, while they have the responsibility of enforcing our immigration laws at the border and interdicting illegal drugs,